DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 293 808 SP 030 131

AUTHOR Simmons, Joanne M.
TITLE "Wha'd She Think?"--A Comparison of the Role Perspectives, Evaluative Judgment Criteria Cognitive Maps, & Written Records of Three University Student Teacher Supervisors.
PUB DATE Feb 88
NOTE 46p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, April 5-9, 1988).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Case Studies; Cognitive Mapping; *Evaluation Criteria; Higher Education; Preservice Teacher Education; *Role Perception; *Student Evaluation; *Student Teacher Supervisors; *Technical Writing

ABSTRACT

Case study methodology using structured interviewing and cognitive mapping techniques has been used to reveal the contrasting role perspectives and evaluative judgment criteria of three university student teacher supervisors with different professional backgrounds. This study extends an earlier investigation by comparing these role perspectives and judgment criteria with the results of content analysis of each supervisor's written observation records and final reports for a nominated sample of six so-called strong, average, and weak student teachers with whom she worked. The implications of these findings for future research and for the selection, training, and on-going support of such supervisors are presented. Data from the study are displayed in 10 tables and 44 references are included. (Author/JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED293808

"WHA'D SHE THINK?" --- A COMPARISON OF THE ROLE PERSPECTIVES, EVALUATIVE JUDGMENT CRITERIA COGNITIVE MAPS, & WRITTEN RECORDS OF THREE UNIVERSITY STUDENT TEACHER SUPERVISORS

February 1988

Joanne M. Simmons, Ph.D.

Supervisory Judgment Research Project
Michigan State University
Department of Teacher Education
Erickson Hall
East Lansing, Michigan 48824

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. M. Simmons

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Mailing address: 4160 Burton SE
Grand Rapids, Michigan 49506

Office telephone: 616 - 458 - 6805

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Asociation, New Orleans, April 1988.

SP030131

Author's Background: Simmons is an Associate Professor in Michigan State University's Department of Teacher Education and MSU's Grand Rapids Teacher Education Center. She has taught graduate courses in clinical supervision and been a student teacher supervisor for eight years. She is a member of the Supervisory Judgment Research (SJR) Project team at MSU together with Roger C. Niemeyer and R. Arden Moon.

NOTE: The author wishes to thank Marcia K. Schuette and Suzanne Potts for their assistance in editing this report and in data coding.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"Wha'd She Think?" --- A Comparison of the Role Perspectives, Evaluative Judgment Criteria Cognitive Maps, & Written Records of Three University Student Teacher Supervisors [2/88 draft]

Abstract: Case study methodology using structured interviewing and cognitive mapping techniques has been used to reveal the contrasting role perspectives and evaluative judgment criteria of three university student teacher supervisors with different professional backgrounds. This study extends an earlier investigation by comparing these role perspectives and judgment criteria with the results of content analysis of each supervisor's written observation records and final reports for a nominated sample of six so-called strong, average, and weak student teachers with whom she worked. The implications of these findings for future research and for the selection, training, and on-going support of such supervisors are presented.

Outline:

1 - introduction

2 - origin & focus of this investigation

3 - alternative views of the student teaching experience & its supervision

4 - who are typical university student teaching supervisors?

5 - profiles of the three university supervisors studied

6 - general data collection instruments & procedures

7 - investigation results: supervisory role perspectives
TABLE 1: ROLE PERSPECTIVES OF THE THREE SUPERVISORS

8 - investigation results: the identification of evaluative judgment criteria which supervisors think that they use
TABLES 2a-b-c: SPECIFIC EVALUATIVE JUDGMENT CRITERIA STATEMENTS & WEIGHTS IDENTIFIED BY THREE SUPERVISORS [Fran/Renee/Leslie]
TABLE 2d: CATEGORIES OF EVALUATIVE JUDGMENT CRITERIA & WEIGHTS IDENTIFIED BY THE THREE SUPERVISORS
TABLE 2e: COMPOSITIVE PORTRAITS OF AN EFFECTIVE STUDENT TEACHER HELD BY THE SUPERVISORS ACCORDING TO THE CRITERIA & WEIGHTS THEY IDENTIFIED
TABLE 3: FLUENCY & COMPLEXITY DIFFERENCES IN THE EVALUATIVE JUDGMENT CRITERIA & WEIGHTS IDENTIFIED BY THE THREE SUPERVISORS

9 - investigation results: the evaluative judgment criteria actually reflected in supervisors' written observation records and final reports
TABLES 4a-b-c: COMPARISON OF THE COGNITIVE MAP CRITERIA STATEMENTS & WRITTEN RECORDS OF THREE SUPERVISORS [Fran/Renee/Leslie]

10 - conclusions & further questions

"Wha'd she think?" --- A comparison of the role perspectives, evaluative judgment criteria cognitive maps, & the written records of three university student teacher supervisors. [2/88 draft]

INTRODUCTION

Despite continuing controversy about the purposes and actual outcomes of the student teaching experience, both student teaching and the role of the university supervisor are universal components of teacher preparation programs. A review of literature on student teaching reveals that a rather unquestioned earlier emphasis on (a) instructional skills development and on (b) teacher socialization as the focus of student teacher supervision and evaluation has given way to the acknowledged existence of alternative paradigms today.

These alternative orientations to desired purposes and outcomes of the student teaching experience provide a conceptual basis for investigating the complex mixture of role perspectives, evaluative judgment criteria, and practices which are found in actual supervision by university faculty (1). Related questions of the characteristics, selection, preparation, and professional development of university supervisors should also be examined.

More specifically, we recognize today that central to all of the on-going interaction among members of the student teaching supervisory triad are each person's expectations or "mental pictures" of the desired criteria, their meaning, and their relative weights. These criteria designate what the person believes would characterize a so-called competent and successful student teacher's overall performance. Such different conceptual maps, one can argue, express and give focus to the specific goals, questions, explanations, tasks, observations, informal conversations, feedback conferences, seminars, evaluation reports, and feelings of overall satisfaction or dissonance occurring for each member of the student teaching triad. While this evaluative judgment process can be considered from each person's perspective in the supervisory triad, the focus here will be on that of the university supervisor.

Given what we are coming to know today concerning the complexities of information processing psychology and of judgmental decision-making for teachers (2) and other professionals (3), it is possible to raise these same questions about the knowledge, beliefs, and judgment criteria of supervisors. Of course, there are many more questions than answers available at this time. In this case, questions include what these judgment criteria are, what is involved in the formation and on-going revision of such conceptual maps, and what is their function as a perceptual screen and an evaluative judgment framework of any particular student teacher during the experience.

The specific content of such supervisor knowledge and beliefs and their function (albeit quite unconsciously in many cases) as a template or mental framework for making judgments regarding student teacher performance seems both intriguing and crucial to better understanding the actual processes of clinical instruction and teacher evaluation. According to both the research literature and an examination of current typical supervisory preparation and practice (4), this topic has been scarcely addressed until now.

ORIGIN & FOCUS OF THIS INVESTIGATION

These questions were originally posed among a small group of experienced university student teacher supervisors and program coordinators in a committee meeting at a large, midwestern research/teacher preparation university. They wondered aloud about the apparent paradox of feeling that the evaluative judgments they made during student teaching supervision were relatively clear-headed, systematic, and well grounded, and yet, on the other hand, they knew each of them supervised differently because of their contrasting knowledge-bases and beliefs. Moreover, they knew from previous conversations that it was difficult at times to find adequate words to discuss what "occurred inside of their heads and hearts" as they went about their supervisory activities and made evaluative judgments about specific student teachers.

In addition, they admitted to having some professional concern that a teacher who received a judgment of "great job!" by one supervisor could be labeled as merely "acceptable" by another supervisor. While these questions were not quite so troublesome in terms of the clinical instructor (i.e. formative evaluation) role of the supervisor, they became acutely problematic in their role of summative evaluator, particularly for judging a marginal student teacher as "PASSING" or as "DEFERRED GRADE --- needs more time and effort to develop" or as "FAILING."

Out of these meta-cognitive insights and curiosity came a reflective discussion group and a series of journaling and data collection activities by the supervisors themselves. Beginning in 1986, a set of interrelated descriptive studies has also been carried out and either published and/or presented at national conferences by the MSU Supervisory Judgment Research Project team (5).

This paper extends the 1986 exploratory study (also by Simmons) which used case study methodology to:

(a) explore the professional backgrounds of three university supervisors and their beliefs concerning the purposes of the student teaching experience and of supervision;

(b) identify the criteria which they have in their cognitive maps of effective student teacher performance; and

(c) continue developing and testing this research methodology for identifying, weighing, and analyzing judgment criteria in a supervisor's cognitive map and their use in actual practice.

This paper will present the second part of the study in which

(d) the evaluative judgment criteria which each supervisor reported using in supervision will be compared to her implicit judgment criteria-in-actual-use.

The criteria-in-actual-use will be identified and investigated through content analysis of each supervisor's classroom observation/conference notes and the final written reports for a nominated sample of six so-called weak, average, and strong student teachers with whom she has worked. A total of 18 cases will be analyzed, i.e. three supervisors x six student teachers each.

These two related studies by Simmons seek to provide methodological contrast to the exploratory studies carried out by other members of the same research team who have focused more holistically on supervisory thinking processes rather than specific judgment criteria. In addition, it seeks to expand what is known in this general area by adding three more cases to the research team's other case studies.

All of these exploratory, descriptive investigations are part of a larger, long-range research plan to identify "effective student teacher performance" cognitive map criteria and to analyze their meaning and use by each of the three individuals in the student teaching supervisory triad. Eventually, this methodology has the potential to be also useful in parallel studies of supervisors (e.g. principals and mentors) with experienced teachers and in investigations of clinical instruction and evaluation in other complex, professional, occupational settings such as medicine and counseling. This effort to describe and better understand "what is" in typical supervisory practice today should provide a basis for more focused, future research studies as well as for improving supervisory training and practice. Taken as a whole, this set of studies emphasizes the importance of the supervisor's implicit cognitive schema and processes --- i.e. knowledge, thinking processes, and belief systems --- in addition to the more typical focus on supervisory techniques.

ALTERNATIVE VIEWS OF THE STUDENT TEACHING EXPERIENCE & ITS SUPERVISION

A number of recent reviews concerning the goals, organizational structure, and actual operation of teacher preparation programs, particularly in terms of field experience and student teaching, have been conducted. These include the overall survey of preservice teacher education by Joyce, Yarger, and Howey (6), surveys and analyses concerning early field experience (7), and reviews focusing both on field experience in general (8) and specifically on the student teaching experience itself (9). After reviewing such literature, Zeichner concludes as do we on the Supervisory Judgment Research team that:

> It is clear from any examination of the literature on field experiences that there is no agreed upon definition of the purposes and goals of either early field experience or student teaching and that there is a great deal of variety in the ways in which these experiences are conceptualized, organized, and actually implemented even within a single institution. (....) This discovery supports the general claim made by many researchers regarding the inappropriateness of deriving an understanding of an instructional program from statements of goals and instructional plans alone ... and emphasizes the importance of examining how programs are actually implemented in the field. (10) [n.b. emphasis added]

In his now classic 1983 article (11), Zeichner delineates five alternative models or paradigms of teacher education research and practice which can be used in this case to more closely examine the various goals, perspectives, and supervisory practices which can be found in student teaching. The four approaches which Zeichner discusses are: (a) behavioristic, (b) personalistic, (c) traditional-craft, and (d) inquiry-oriented. A fifth approach, the academic paradigm, is also identifiable, but Zeichner chooses to regard its emphasis on a sound liberal education for teachers as a common assumption of the four other paradigms.

The five alternative paradigms, Zeichner says, "can (each) be thought of as a matrix of beliefs and assumptions about the nature and purposes of schooling, teaching, teachers and their education that gives shape to specific forms of practice in teacher education" (12). Thus, these paradigms can be useful in

revealing alternative goal structures which are often unstated and even unconsciously held by members of the supervisory triad. These goal structures can function as a basis for developing quite contrasting cognitive maps of "successful student teacher performance". As Zeichner correctly points out, such paradigms are not totally distinct from each other in actual use. Rather, they reflect relative shifts in emphasis placed on the prospective teacher's desired content knowledge, technical skills, emotional qualities, and intellectual characteristics.

Because the distinctions which Zeichner makes among these alternative program goal structures are fairly well known and have already been discussed more extensively in the 1986 Simmons paper, they will be only briefly summarized here as a framework for the data analysis to be reported.

The behavioristic approach to teacher education emphasizes development and performance of technical skills of classroom teaching which have been identified according to some research model of effective teaching and learning. The competency-based teacher education movement is the most visible expression of this paradigm. According to this view, criteria for successful teaching emphasize the observable demonstration of specific instructional skills without simultaneous concern for the teacher's underlying intellectual and emotional processes associated with those behaviors.

The second major paradigm which Zeichner discusses is personalistic teacher education which seeks "to promote the psychological maturity of prospective teachers and emphasize the reorganization of perceptions and beliefs over the mastery of specific behaviors, skills, and content knowledge" (13). This view emphasizes effective teaching as a matter of each person discovering her/his own style, purposes, and understanding. Evidence of a student teacher's success would be external manifestations of internal cognitive, perceptual, and emotional growth related to the role of classroom teacher. Such evidence is assessed according to a particular developmental model of so-called maturity in cognitive processes, teacher concerns, or emotional growth.

The traditional-craft or apprenticeship paradigm of teacher education emphasizes developing the "wisdom of the practitioner" as a complex mixture of instructional skills and knowledge about effective teaching which is discovered through trial and error. Such an approach emphasizes "learning to fit" into established classroom practices, teacher culture, and schools as they "realistically" are. Thus, the loss of simplistic idealism about children, moving through lessons efficiently, managing the pupils and classroom effectively, and complying with paperwork demands would be regarded as evidence of becoming "mature" in a professional sense. With the exception of scattered innovations, the apprenticeship model of student teaching is the predominate one found today in the United States.

Inquiry-oriented teacher education is the fourth paradigm which Zeichner discusses. Such an approach emphasizes "that technical skill in teaching is to be highly valued, not as an end in itself, but as a means for bringing about desired ends. Questions about what ought to be done take on primary importance and the process of critical inquiry is viewed as a necessary supplement to the ability to carry out the tasks themselves". This view "requires that prospective teachers render as problematic that which is frequently taken for granted about the role of teacher, the tasks of teaching, and schooling in general" (14). Thus, in addition to development of the technical skills of effective teaching, content mastery, and the prospective teacher's own interests and maturity, such a program would teach and assess the teacher's inquiry skills and corresponding reflective, analytical abilities and habits.

Zeichner's five paradigms, then, provide contrasting vantage points for determining what a university supervisor would expect of a "successful" student teacher (15). In most cases, of course, the criteria actually used by the university supervisor, cooperating teacher, and student teacher are implicitly held and are drawn in an eclectic fashion from all the paradigms but with varying degrees of emphasis on each viewpoint.

WHO ARE TYPICAL UNIVERSITY STUDENT TEACHER SUPERVISORS?

Unfortunately, there is more literature available concerning the perspectives, roles, and practices of both student teachers and classroom cooperating teachers than of university supervisors. In addition, many of the early studies are now somewhat dated (16) and often did not distinguish between university supervisors of early field experiences and those working with student teachers.

In their 1977 survey of preservice teacher education in the United States, Joyce, Yarger, and Howey (17) provide information concerning the professional backgrounds and load assignments of a national, stratified random sample of teacher educators. They report that 90% of such faculty members had public school teaching and administration experience, with an average of eight years and two years longevity respectively. More than half (54%) reported that they were involved in supervision of student teachers.

The second major national survey available in the literature regarding university student teacher supervisors was reported by Bowman in 1978. He obtained information from 94 (or 88.7%) directors of student teaching programs operated in the 109 state colleges and land grant colleges in this country. His study reports that "overall, the permanent faculty plus doctoral students was the most commonly used staffing pattern for supervision, and was reported by 38 (40.4 percent) of the 94 schools" (18). Bowman also found that 31.5% of the responding schools used subject area specialists, 12% used generalist supervisors, and 56.5% used combinations of these to supervise their student teachers. After reviewing the few comparative studies (19) on distinctions between clinical generalist and content area specialist approaches, McIntyre concluded that subject area specialists "often have little or no training in supervision" and are not usually viewed as being as skillful, knowledgeable, available, or concerned as clinical generalist supervisors by student teachers and cooperating teachers (20).

Perhaps the most interesting data in the Bowman 1978 study have to do with institutional efforts to ensure competency in student teacher supervisors. This is an almost unaddressed topic in the literature. Bowman concluded: "Teacher preparation institutions have often been accused (by their own students as well as by public school personnel) of showing a lack of concern for the competency of the supervisor of student teaching. This criticism appears partly justified. One-third of the schools in this study seem to assume the competency of this person in the student teaching triad. (.....) Taken as an entire group, more schools reported 'teaching experience' than any other form of (more) formal effort to determine competency of the supervisor" (21). Because of the acknowledged lack of other pertinent literature on this topic (22), it is not known how much (if at all) this view of the appropriate qualifications for university supervisors has changed since 1978, but we suspect that it has not.

In their 1981 study, Griffin et al went one step further and concluded: "Often, clinical supervision is an added responsibility to an already overburdened staff. As such, it is assigned to graduate students and assistants who must 'pay their dues'." The perceived nature of supervision is as "a low priority task with little benefit" in academia. They concluded that "the degree to which they function effectively as supervisors depends heavily on support, encouragement, and rewards available for that service" (23). However, such respect for student teacher supervision is currently difficult to find in the academic world.

In light of the 1977 Joyce et al survey findings, the majority of teacher educators in this country are involved in the role of student teacher supervisor. An important broader perspective on the topic can be obtained by examining beliefs and backgrounds of traditional teacher educators as a group and environmental tensions which surround their work in higher education. The theme which emerges from Lanier's controversial review of this literature is that teacher educators as a group are held in low esteem and relegated to the lower end of the academic stratification ladder by others in higher education, possess lower traditional scholarship commitments and interests, and de-value intellectual questioning and conceptual analysis. According to Lanier, among the major reasons for this is "... a disproportionally large number of faculty teaching teachers most directly have come from lower middle class backgrounds. It is very likely that they obtain conformist orientations and utilitarian views of knowledge from their childhood experiences at home, educational opportunities in school, and restrictive conditions of work as teachers before coming to higher education." (24)

In addition to Lanier's criticism of traditional teacher educators' intellectual rigor and commitment, the actual effectiveness of the university supervisor has been broadly questioned from the perspectives of both those in academia and the school sites. McIntyre (25) has reviewed various studies indicating that the university supervisor may have either positive or little actual influence, while Thies-Sprinthall (26) have documented that a negative effect can actually occur.

Our MSU Supervisory Judgment Research team's concerns are underscored by the findings of the only other similar study completed in this topic. As part of a recent set of comprehensive studies of clinical preservice teacher education carried out at the University of Texas/Austin Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, O'Neal (27) focused on the perceptions, feedback, and evaluation practices used by nine university supervisors. After comparing the content of their supervisory conferences and final evaluation reports with university student teaching goal statements and evaluation criteria statements, O'Neal concluded that the conferences and final reports largely reflected individual perceptions and concerns. In a related report, Edwards concluded:

> Satisfaction, fulfillment of expectations, and satisfactory performance evaluations of the student teacher should not be assumed to indicate that the experience resulted in professional growth and the acquisition of compentent teaching behaviors. (.....) Personal characteristics and the degree of match between perceptions and values of the members of the triad are highly predictive of the interactions and evaluations which take place in the clinical experience. (.....) Craft knowledge and 'common sense' are the basis of most decisions regarding specific clinical experiences. (28)

Thus, there is research evidence which coincides with our own Supervisory Judgment Research team's perceptions that, indeed, the effectiveness of the student teaching experience can vary with individual characteristics of the persons involved. Furthermore, there can be little (if any) actual similarity existing among supervisors and little similarity between supervisors and the teacher education goals and program in which they work. This, of course, raises important reliability and validity questions about the evaluative judgments made by supervisors.

Therefore, it is pertinent overall to question if a so-called circular problem regarding university student teacher supervision has not been unwittingly created over the years. The relationship between validity and reliability questions concerning evaluative judgments, seemingly weak job selection criteria used for identifying university supervisors, and the apparent lack of concern or agreement about how to prepare and reward supervisors in both the K-12 school and academic workplaces has been described here.

This leads us to wonder if Lortie's comments (29) about negative consequences of a wide decision range for classroom teachers are not equally relevant and damaging in the case of university supervisors. Griffin et al (30) have referred to this as "selection by default" and link it to unsupportive institutional context for supervision in university teacher education departments. If a job is perceived as requiring little or no particular focused preparation and knowledge-base, and if there are conflicting job demands and unrewarding structures for it in both university and school settings, it is perhaps all too easy even for teacher educators to underestimate the complex knowledge, beliefs, skills, and processes which are realistically involved in functioning effectively in clinical instruction settings. Currently, we know little about the influence of these subtle factors in shaping: (a) selection, preparation, and incentive structure for these supervisors, (b) professional knowledge-base, attitudes, and practices of supervisors themselves, and (c) validity and reliability of evaluative judgments they make.

In summary, serious concern about the impact of these factors on both the instructional quality of the student teaching experience as well as on the validity and reliability of evaluative judgments made by the supervisor seems clearly warranted. Furthermore, such a situation undermines the development of both adequate supervisory research and practice in this country at a time when more attention than ever is being given to the need for encouraging continuous teacher growth across different career stages.

Hence, the efforts of our MSU Supervisory Judgment Research Project team are directed at obtaining a better descriptive understanding of typical supervisors' backgrounds, role perspectives, evaluative judgment criteria, thinking processes, and language as a basis for more focused research studies and for the improvement of supervisory preparation programs.

PROFILES OF THE THREE UNIVERSITY SUPERVISORS STUDIED

Three university supervisors representing contrasting backgrounds in terms of being (a) a clinical generalist or content specialist, (b) trained or untrained, and (c) experienced or novice were identified:

(1) Renee, a novice supervisor (less than one year) with 11 years of elementary classroom teaching experience and a masters degree plus 30 credits in elementary education;

(2) Fran, an experienced supervisor (five years) with 10 years of elementary and junior high classroom teaching experience and ABD level status in the university's doctoral program in supervision and teacher preparation/staff development; and
(3) Leslie, an experienced supervisor (three years) with 20 years of elementary classroom teaching experience and a doctorate in reading/language arts.

The names reported here for the three supervisors are same-gender pseudonyms.

All three supervisors are part-time student teacher supervisors. For Renee, this involves a part-time job at a major research/teacher preparation university. Fran is a doctoral student employed on a half-time basis to coordinate the overall program in one of the same university's off-campus sites where she and Renee both supervise student teachers. Leslie is a full-time associate professor at a private, liberal arts college where she coordinates her institution's student teaching program, supervises, and also teaches reading/language arts methods courses. In terms of the categories of typical supervisors, Renee represents the generalist lacking both experience and specialized training, Fran is an experienced generalist with advanced training regarding supervision, and Leslie is an experienced supervisor who lacks supervisory preparation but who has a specific content area focus. This range of professional backgrounds appears to be quite congruent with conventional practice concerning the selection, training, and previous experience of typical student teacher supervisors in this country today.

GENERAL DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENTS & PROCEDURES

Data were collected from the three supervisors during individual scheduled appointments held from January - June 1986. Each supervisor participated in four cognitive mapping and interview data collection appointments of approximately 30 - 60 minutes held at the beginning, middle, end, and after the end of the student teaching experience. Renee and Fran both supervise within a 11-week quarter timeframe, while Leslie's college has a 15-week semester experience. Four distinct data collection points were used to explore if there were any developmental changes in the judgment criteria which supervisors identified for different time points of the student's teaching experience. In addition, each supervisor was asked to make available the written supervisory records for a pair of so-called weak, average, and strong student teachers (a total of six) with whom she was working. Information regarding each supervisor's professional background, supervisory goals, knowledge, and beliefs, learning style, and level of cognitive development was also obtained through use of standard paper/pencil tests at the first appointment and through an interview during the final appointment. These were chosen based on a review of the literature which suggested that these factors could influence the process and outcomes of student teacher supervision.

Such an amalgum of qualitative and quantitative data collection provides a rich and extensive data base for data analyses regarding cognitive map judgment criteria, corresponding written supervisory communication and records, and underlying role perspectives of these student teacher supervisors.

As with any case study investigation using self-reported data, caution must be expressed about the generalizability of these findings and the "social

desirability" factor in cognitive map criteria and interview answers given. The researcher took the following steps to minimize these limitations:

(1) developed a relaxed, collegial interview climate;
(2) stated the research purpose as one which emphasized the non-judgmental description of current supervisory beliefs and practices;
(3) communicated genuine respect for the complex job of serving as a university supervisor;
(4) gave specific attention to discussing both positive and negative factors as "normal" in any job setting; and
(5) provided typical assurances of confidentiality to research subjects, student teachers, and their institutions.

INVESTIGATION RESULTS: SUPERVISORY ROLE PERSPECTIVES

Each supervisor's role perspectives were investigated through interview questions which focused on elements of job qualifications and satisfaction, professional development needs, role definition, goals for the student teaching experience, supervisory beliefs and practices. These interviews were tape recorded and later transcribed for analysis. The 1986 paper by Simmons focused predominately on analyzing these role perspective interviews with the three supervisors, so these findings will be only briefly summarized here as a framework for the other data analysis and conclusions drawn.

When asked about the positive and negative aspects of being a university student teacher supervisor, the reported positive aspects of their work (see TABLE 1) involve what could be called practitioner, action-oriented dimensions related to people's growth, communication, and interaction on a day-by-day basis. Interestingly, Renee, who is the novice supervisor, did not identify any negative features of her job. Reported negative aspects of student teacher supervision for Fran and Leslie involved time management conflicts, lack of expressed institutional support, paperwork and phone calls necessary for making student teacher placements, and the occasional need to make negative evaluation judgments about student teachers who do not perceive their own difficulties.

These answers are strikingly similar to Lortie's 1975 findings (31) regarding the reasons given by classroom teachers for being attracted to their occupation. Lieberman and Miller (32) refer to such practitioner interests and cognitive orientation as belonging to the world of action as opposed to the world of explicit theories and ideas. Along with lacking clear, immediate evidence of one's effectiveness, such occupations necessarily press one to act and believe in the intentions of one's instructional actions, rather than to stand back and question in a detached manner as in the world of research. This acritical, practitioner stance is illustrated by the finding that with the exception of one comment from Leslie, these supervisors' role perspectives do not seem to include any view of themselves as working to change or reform current school or teaching practices. The implication of this is to suggest that these supervisors would be very comfortable with the apprenticeship paradigm and disinclined toward the inquiry paradigm for the student teaching experience and their roles in it.

Each supervisor was also asked about her own professional development needs and what recurring issues or questions she had concerning the role of a university student teacher supervisor. This was an effort to ascertain the ability to self-evaluate and to determine the types of practitioner and/or theoretical issues about which they thought. These findings closely resemble distinctions made among self - task - impact stages of teacher development by Frances Fuller (33). These answers can also be used to suggest topics to consider when preparing and supporting supervisors.

For Renee, the new supervisor, her concerns clearly focused on personal and pragmatic uncertainities --- e.g. not knowing and not correctly following university policies, her own job security, and wanting to know more clearly when she had done a "good" job as a supervisor. Such task and self concerns with the need for information and external feedback and reassurance are predictable in someone who is a novice in any job position. In contrast, Fran identified specific areas of practitioner-oriented needs related to her own effectiveness in carrying out supervisory tasks --- e.g. how to conduct better seminars, professionalizing her own pedagogical language, knowing more about adult and staff development, learning more about how teachers learn. She also spoke of her concerns related to improved program management. As an experienced and trained supervisor, Fran's answers may be characterized as primarily task and impact-oriented with some very modest elements of theory-related curiosity. Leslie's reported concerns range from personal to pragmatic to political --- e.g. career counseling skills, greater self-confidence and skill in negative evaluation situations, increased knowledge of various supervisory techniques, curiosity about adult learning and individual differences, and serious questions regarding her own role and that of education in social justice issues. Thus, in contrast to Renee and Fran, Leslie's intellectual perspective as a supervisor would seem to have both a critical, abstract thrust as well as pragmatic and personal dimensions. In Fuller's terms, we find Leslie expressing concerns for self, task, and impact as a supervisor.

Thus, based on the data considered here, Leslie (and to some lesser extent, Fran) is a counter-example of Lanier's assertion that the professional background and job assignment of typical teacher education faculty lead them to de-value intellectual questioning. Despite her lack of formal training in supervision, Leslie's questions may develop naturally out of her own cognitive style and complexity and wide-range of interests. In addition, her reported habit of seeking out things to read related to supervision and her eager participation in a local student teacher supervisor network group suggest that it is possible to develop and sustain such intellectual curiosity and growth (even for supervisors lacking formal training) if professional resources related to supervision are made available and questioning is encouraged. By contrast, whether due to the lack of easily available resources and/or to her own lack of developmental "readiness" to address supervisory impact concerns apart from a strong focus on self, such curiosity is not seen in Renee's case.

Unfortunately, there is not other research literature available which describes the self-perceived needs and concerns of supervisors, so little is known yet concerning the relationship of these factors to the actual evaluative judgments and effectiveness of supervisors. However, we have a basis here

for identifying important questions to guide further exploration of this topic. These questions would include:

- Does a supervisor's stage of self - task - impact developmental concerns influence her/his perception and responsiveness to a student teacher's own needs and concerns? How?
- What are the advantages and disadvantages of a supervisor's strong practitioner-orientation and often personal and acritical stance toward current school and teaching practices?
- What differences exist between in judgments made and the knowledge-base actually used by individuals with and without supervisory training?
- How does the current technique-oriented type of supervisory training hinder the development of a more theoretical and a reflective perspective in supervisors?
- How does this interact with the current predominance of the apprenticeship paradigm for student teaching programs?

Analysis of the interviews and each supervisor's reported evaluation criteria and weights reveals that all three supervisors hold a view of the purpose of the student teaching experience and their role as supervisors (see TABLE 1) which is congruent with Zeichner's apprenticeship paradigm. That is, the purpose is, in Fran's words, to "give a student teacher a taste, as real a taste as possible, of what a real teaching situation is over time". However, while Fran focused more on the instructional value of this for the student teacher as a basis for professional growth and career goal clarification, Leslie emphasized more of an evaluative focus, i.e., "the purpose is ... to find out whether, when thrown into the deep end of the pool,one sinks or swims". Renee's comments seemed to intertwine these two perspectives as inseparable.

Each supervisor was also asked about her views of the Clinical Instructor and Evaluator roles in supervision and of the emphasis she places on each across the unfolding timeline of the student teaching experience (see TABLE 1). Each person's answer was consistent with the purposes which she sees for the student teaching experience described above.

Fran seems to separate these two roles in her work according to the changing time frame of the quarter. She reported that she derives more satisfaction and gives more importance and time to the Clinical Instructor role, both in terms of classroom observation/conferencing and in the weekly group seminars. Depending on the topic, she does this in either a non-directive manner (40.2%) or a directive style (33.5%) in terms of Glickman's (34) distinctions in supervisory beliefs and style (see TABLE 1). Fran sees her Instructional role now as very parallel to her previous work as an elementary/junior high classroom teacher --- "it gives me the chance to help someone develop from point A to point K or M or whatever. Once that's over, and the evaluation part takes over at the end of the quarter, that working, that manipulation if you will, that's over, and I can't do anything more. So, I simply have to make a judgment on what I've done already."

Renee's views would seem to be between Fran and Leslie's. She stated that the Clinical Instructor role and the Evaluator roles are intertwined for her --- "When you are critiquing, at the same time, you should be teaching ... One can't be without the other". Renee's supervisory style is split evenly (40.2%) between Glickman's non-directive and collaborative styles. The Evaluator role is one she accepts very comfortably as part of the job, and her view of evalutive feedback to student teachers emphasizes its instructional

value for them as well as her own responsibility as evaluator --- "As an evaluator, I've always tried to make it on a very personal, one-to-one level. If anything, it's very much 'constructive criticism'. I want it to be something they can learn from. I'm trying very hard not to hurt feelings, but at the same time, always being very truthful with them. So, the evalution part is very important, and it's learning how to handle each person."

For Leslie, the university supervisor is more primarily cast in the Evaluator role due to the typical time sampling schedule of the supervisor's observation visits to the school, with the cooperating teacher seen as the Clinical Instructor for the student teacher. At the same time, she believes that her Clinical Instructor role is further "dependent on the receptivity of the student teacher to my instruction or authority. (....) I can diagnose and offer suggestions, and whether or not they follow up on them, in a sense, I don't know because I don't stick around forever (to see)." Such a view corresponds closely to her predominately (53.6%) non-directive supervisory style and beliefs and to a stated emphasis on helping her student teachers to think as a result of her evaluative feedback. Leslie makes a shift in supervisory roles across the length of the experience as Fran and Renee do, but Leslie places sharper emphasis on the Evaluator role much earlier---"I really stop doing any kind of clinical stuff at the halfway point, if not before, except in a sense, if people still need that and look for that, then they're in trouble (of not doing well) in my estimation". When such evaluations are negative, this experience can be "extremely difficult and painful" for Leslie.

Leslie's use of the term "suggestions" for her evaluative feedback, her own pre-dominately non-directive supervisory style, and her acknowledgment of the early shift from a Clinical Instructor role to an Evaluator role during the experience are striking in comparison with Fran and Renee. In terms of the issues which this situation raises, it is true that supervisory training and experience can provide a means for modifying lack of clarity and confidence regarding one's role and the evaluative judgments made as a supervisor. On the other hand, a high level of reported self-confidence (or conversely stated, a lack of self-doubt) in making evaluative judgments does not necessarily mean that a supervisor is making valid or reliable judgments. In other words, it could be that, despite her lack of training in supervision, Leslie is simply more conscious of and articulate about the complexities of supervisor perception, learning to teach, and her own respect for the need of each student teacher to gradually develop a personal teaching style and his/her own pedagogical judgment. In addition to training, these differences can also be due to personal characteristics of the supervisor herself such as self-efficacy, contrasting supervisory goals, reflective habits, cognitive complexity, and style.

Much remains to be investigated in this area in the future. Important sub-questions to investigate further here would include:

- Is there a loss of the student teacher's "opportunity to learn" if the supervisor is too Evaluation role oriented early in the experience?
- How do the supervisor's own feelings about the Evaluation role, particularly for making negative evaluation judgments, possibly undermine suitably rigorous evaluation of student teachers?

- What is the appropriate balance to strike between confidence in one's perceptions and evaluative judgments and openness to the need for gathering more adequate evidence and for revising one's initial evaluative judgments?
- How does a supervisor's preference for either the Clinical Instructor role or the Evaluative role and her/his supervisory style influence interaction between members of the student teaching triad?

In a 1986 study which underscores the importance of these questions, Desrochers (35) reported that teachers' perceptions of supervisor knowledge, usefulness, and style were all highly correlated. In other words, we need to know more about how such student teacher and cooperating teacher perceptions of the usefulness of the supervisor's clinical instruction and judgments can undermine the quality of the student teaching experience itself.

Thus, this data analysis indicates that important differences in supervisory role perspectives and styles do, indeed, exist, even in this limited sample of only three student teacher supervisors with contrasting backgrounds. What remains to be explored now is: what differences (if any) do these make in evaluative judgment criteria and supervisory practice?

INVESTIGATION RESULTS: THE IDENTIFICATION OF EVALUATIVE JUDGMENT CRITERIA WHICH SUPERVISORS THINK THAT THEY USE

The second focus of this study involved seeing if the three supervisors could identify the evaluative judgment criteria which they believe they use in making evaluative judgments at the beginning, middle, and end of the student teaching experience. In addition, questions of how the criteria statements and weights would compare among the three supervisors and if there would be any changes in criteria or weights across the timeframe of the experience were of interest. The research methodology used will be described in some detail because one goal of the study involved pilot-testing these cognitive mapping and structured interview techniques in an effort to identify the normally implicit judgment criteria of supervisors.

In three separate appointments held throughout the quarter/semester, each supervisor was asked to identify the criteria she thought she used in making supervisory judgments. The criteria were recorded in the supervisor's own words using words or phrases which clearly expressed separate statements of knowledge, skills, attitudes, values, habits, etc. which would indicate how well a student teacher was functioning. Such evidence could be gathered in any of the typical supervisory interaction situations --- e.g., conversations, seminar discussions, classroom teaching observations, review of written materials prepared by the student teacher, comments from the cooperating teacher or principal, etc. It was pointed out that all such evidence-producing situations could be relevant information-gathering opportunities for the supervisor who, in turn, would process this information in order to make judgments or decisions about the relative success or difficulty which a student teacher was having.

In addition to identifying these criteria, each supervisor was asked to indicate the relative importance or weight of each criteria statement in her overall judgment about the student teacher's performance at that time in the

experience by recording a number from 1 - 100 in front of each statement. The total weights allocated among all the criteria had to total 100 for each time point in the experience.

At the second and third data collection appointments, after she had indicated the criteria and weights she used at that particular point of the experience, each supervisor was also shown her previous lists. Then she was asked if she would like to make any revisions in the material. In this way, the criteria and weights obtained at each data collection appointment were not biased or influenced by what was said previously. At the same time, there was an on-going, informal check of test/retest reliability and face validity of the supervisor's emerging cognitive map criteria statements and weights. In this study, although each supervisor carefully re-read her previous list(s) in response to the researcher's directive, no changes were made to the criteria lists or their weights by any of the three supervisors.

In addition, at the fourth appointment, each supervisor was asked to organize her three sets of criteria statements into an overall cognitive map containing both a vertical and horizontal matrix pattern. This would reveal if any developmental changes occurred from the beginning/middle/end of the experience (horizonal rows). She was also asked to cluster and label sets of criteria in vertical columns according to the conceptual similarities she saw among them. When this was completed, she was asked if any she wanted to revise, add, or subtract any criteria statements or weights, but no changes were made by any of the three supervisors.

The results of this study indicate that these three supervisors were able to identify and weight the criteria which they believe they use and were able to organize their criteria statements into a horizontal and vertical cognitive matrix without much difficulty. TABLES 2a-b-c report the different evaluative judgment criteria categories, specific statements, and weights identified by each supervisor for the beginning (B), middle (M), and end (E) points of student teaching. Similar criteria statements for different timepoints of the experience are listed together in the tables so that consistency may be readily noticed. The average weights and rankings of criteria are also shown.

Thus, in terms of the research team's interest in pilot-testing this data gathering methodology, judgment criteria cognitive mapping done in this manner and within the limits of all self-reported data is both practical and has face validity and test-retest reliability in this initial study. The additional, important question about the predictive validity of these cognitive map criteria will be addressed in the final section of this paper, using comparisons of these criteria statements and their weights with actual final reports and observation notes made by each supervisor for the nominated sample of strong, average, and weak student teachers.

In terms of specific criteria statements identified by all three supervisors, attention to such traditional student teaching topics as content area knowledge, classroom management, planning, communication skills, self-confidence as a teacher, and rapport with pupils and staff can be found in TABLES 2a-b-c. These criteria seem congruent with "conventional wisdom" which surrounds student teaching supervision in this country and with typical student teacher seminar topics and evaluation forms. In terms of concern for the validity of supervisors' criteria, it is encouraging also to note that these topics are featured prominately in research on effective teaching from the past 25 years. Caution, however, must be expressed because these data do not allow us to know very clearly how these supervisors understand the meaning

and use of these ideas related to effective teaching --- i.e. Simmons and Sparks (36) caution against believing that such research should provide "rules" for good practice rather than "conceptual tools" for reflective, contextual, instructional decision-making by teachers. There is no evidence in the supervisors' criteria lists which illustrates concern for such decision-making by the student teachers whom they supervise.

While the overall commonalities among many of the supervisors' criteria are generally reassuring, a closer analysis of TABLES 2a-b-c also indicates certain criteria statements which are unique to one supervisor --- e.g. Fran: commitment to the student teaching experience (40% beginning); Renee: atmosphere of classroom (8% beginning), interior of classroom --- bulletin board, art projects, etc. (7% beginning); Leslie: mastery of several methods/techniques of teaching (17% end), self-directed professional development goal setting (5% middle/16% end), attention to inter-disciplinary teaching (5% beginning/2% middle/5% end). Such findings coincide with the researcher's own supervisory experiences and early hunches that there are important differences in beliefs about effective teaching, and hence, in evaluation criteria among supervisors.

It is possible to easily note that there are some sizable and important differences existing in the categories and their weights among the three supervisors. As an example from TABLE 2d, the most easily recognized category of CONTENT KNOWLEDGE & CLASSROOM TEACHING SKILLS ranges in overall importance from 35% (Leslie) to 45% (Fran) to 53% (Renee). The emphasis given specifically to CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT also varies from 15% (Fran) to 9% (Renee) to 5% (Leslie). TABLE 2e indicates some differences existing in the supervisors' composite portraits of an "effective student teacher" when their five most heavily weighted criteria statements are considered.

Analysis of the data here also supports a developmental view of student teacher growth. In this case, these supervisors' judgment criteria and relative weights change across the beginning/middle/end timeframe of the student teaching experience (see TABLES 2a-b-c-d). That is, the evidence these supervisors report looking for differs at each point in the experience. Having noted them, early factors diminish in importance in the supervisors' ever-evolving evaluative judgment, just as new criteria emerge. Those developmental criteria patterns are strongest in the data from Fran and Leslie, the two supervisors with the greatest amount of experience and advanced training.

Early emphasis is placed on the student teacher's personality, attitude, content knowledge, and interpersonal skills, according to the patterns found in TABLES 2a-b-c-d. Midpoint emphasis is on instructional delivery and classroom management skills, and finally, late emphasis concerns professional growth habits and self-confidence. The question of whether student teachers evaluated as "weaker" somehow "get stuck" or are not perceived as progressing through this loosely constructed developmental pattern will be addressed in the last part of this study.

Another interesting variation among the three supervisors occurred in terms of idea or criteria statement complexity and fluency, two dimensions by which cognitive maps are routinely analyzed (see TABLE 3). Renee, the part-time, novice supervisor without specialized training, used the least amount of time to identify her criteria, stated them in the fewest words, and distinguished only minimally among them in terms of their relative weights. Fran and Leslie used longer periods of time to think about the task, were more detailed in

their explanations of each criteria statement, and distinguished more sharply among the various criteria in terms of their relative weights. Leslie is notable for identifying more than twice as many criteria statements as Fran and for organizing her criteria into the largest number of subgroups in her final overall cognitive map.

Given these differences in the supervisors' data, four variables seem useful in understanding these variations: (a) their amount of supervisory experience and knowledge-base, (b) their degree of involvement in program operation and management, and two more general constructs that could be called overall (c) language fluency and (d) cognitive complexity.

In terms of the supervisors' self-reported judgment criteria, the data suggest a refinement of what has been adapted here from Zeichner's alternative paradigms as a criteria framework for evaluating student teachers. Both the specific criteria statements and category names indicate these supervisors' beliefs that learning to be successful as a classroom teacher involves the adequate demonstration of three basic components: (1) liberal arts and content area knowledge (the academic paradigm); (2) instructional skills (the behavioristic paradigm); and (3) professional attitudes and identity related to maturity and career commitment (the personalistic paradigm). Except for Leslie's mildly-stated interview comment that she wanted to make student teachers "think about her evaluative feedback", none of the supervisors even hinted at the inquiry-oriented paradigm, Zeichner's fourth, in either their interviews or criteria statements. From the rather conventional perspectives of these supervisors and the programs in which they work, it seems possible to conclude that the apprenticeship paradigm for student teaching can be used as a larger conceptual framework encompassing the other three paradigms. As a set, they stand in sharp contrast to the inquiry-oriented paradigm which focuses on instructional improvement and a change-orientation.

However, if the inquiry paradigm is ever to be genuinely implemented as a teacher and school improvement strategy, it would appear necessary to either select or prepare supervisors more strongly in terms of this inquiry, critical thinking, and more theoretical orientation. This change could also stimulate the development of supervision as a field encompassing more substantial research and improved practices. In turn, supervision could gain a more respected and influential role in both K - 12 schools and academia. The challenge of moving supervision in this direction should be clearer now in light of what has been discussed here about the classroom teaching, action-oriented background and role perspectives of these supervisors, and indeed, of most teacher educators today.

On the other hand, these data simultaneously suggest that the supervisor's practitioner-orientation and abilities are also essential. This would include the ability to skillfully instruct, validly and reliably assess, and articulately discuss a student teacher's growth in each of these apprentice-related areas. Thus, such supervisors need to be neither exclusively clinical instructors nor researchers, but rather "bilingual and bicultural" as Lieberman and Miller (37) stress, functioning effectively in the worlds of both educational research and instructional practice.

In summary, the evaluative judgment criteria data provide us with both good news and bad news. The good news is in the large and rather surprising degree of commonality found both at the level of criteria categories and for most specific criteria statements among the three supervisors. Although they used somewhat different words to express their ideas, broad criteria similarities

emphasizing an apprentice/academic/behavioristic/personalistic paradigm for teacher education can be noted. Furthermore, the topics implied by the supervisors' reported criteria correspond to areas addressed by recent research on effective teaching. On the negative side, there is no evidence of attention to the inquiry paradigm or to the recent emphasis in the literature on reflective, instructional decision-making by teachers.

Several supervisory variables can now be more clearly addressed in future research questions and supervisory training programs:

- What occurs if there are either explicit or implicit major conflicts in the effective teaching criteria believed to be important by each member of the supervisory triad?
- When viewed on a practical level, are the differences which exist among supervisors' judgment criteria and weights generally so minor as to be inconsequential in terms of the issues of evaluation fairness and validity?
- What is the relationship between supervisors' actual understanding of their own "conventional wisdom" evaluative judgment criteria and the recent research on effective teaching?
- Do supervisors with a richer and more detailed understanding of their own judgment criteria "see" (i.e. perceive and process pertinent evidence) and evaluate student teachers differently? What are these differences?
- How does having richer and more detailed language to describe effective teaching influence what a supervisor provides in written and oral feedback to the student teacher? What are the effects of these differences in terms of growth for the student teacher?

Having discussed the similarities and differences occurring in the evaluative judgment criteria which the three supervisors reported using, we will next turn our attention to examining whether or not their stated criteria are reflected in their written supervisory records.

INVESTIGATION RESULTS: THE EVALUATIVE JUDGMENT CRITERIA ACTUALLY REFLECTED IN SUPERVISORS' WRITTEN OBSERVATION RECORDS & FINAL REPORTS

The final part of this study compares supervisors' reported criteria with their implicit judgment criteria-in-actual-use. These were investigated through content analysis of each supervisor's written classroom observation/conference notes and the final reports for a nominated sample of six so-called weak, average, and strong student teachers with whom she had worked. Using only written records to investigate supervisor's implicit evaluative judgments (rather than audiotapes of what occurred orally between the supervisor and the student teacher) should be noted as a clear limitation of this study.

A total of 18 cases from a variety of K - 12 public school settings were analyzed, i.e. three supervisors x six student teachers for each. There were final reports and either four or five classroom observation records available for each of the 18 student teachers. Each supervisor's beginning/middle/end of the student teaching experience criteria lists and her written records were compared in the following manner: (a) the first and second observation data

were compared to the beginning criteria list; (b) the third and fourth observations were compared to the middle criteria list; and (c) the fifth observation and the final report were compared to the end criteria list. If only four observation records existed for a student teacher, the third observation was used in relation to the middle criteria list, and the fourth observation and final report were compared to the end criteria list.

Content analysis of these records involved a two-part process: (a) matching each distinct thought unit in the written records to one or more of the criteria statements in the supervisor's list, and (b) counting the number of words which the supervisor had written regarding that idea in order to derive an average percentage of emphasis which each beginning/middle/end criteria statement received in the written documents. If there were thought units found in the written records which did not match any of the supervisor's criteria statements identified earlier, special note was made of this.

It must be recognized that the array of topics actually found in the written records for a supervisor's student teachers is influenced by many factors, one of which is role of the supervisor's implicit judgment criteria in her selective perception of "evidence" (38). In addition, the teaching situation, content area and level, classroom pupils, cooperating teacher, etc. all influence what activities are carried out, and hence, the topics addressed in the supervisor's clinical feedback and evaluative judgments. By using five or six records from each of 18 cases which represent a broad sample of so-called weak, average, and strong student teachers working in a variety of pre-K - 12 placement settings, this study attempted to avoid such a narrow perspective.

These content analysis procedures took approximately 12 hours across a three-day period and were performed by an individual with 11 years of student teaching supervision experience who was not generally aware of the research questions which guided the investigation. Records for the weak, average, and strong student teachers were reviewed in a blind fashion by this research assistant. Two randomly chosen written records from each supervisor were also content analyzed by the researcher and compared to the coding results obtained by the research assistant. The inter-rater reliability coefficient was calculated to be 0.696 for this comparison.

In terms of the match between the supervisors' cognitive map criteria and the content of their written records, a surprising degree of congruence was found. There were only one (Leslie) or two (Fran and Renee) un-codable thought units found in the written records, and their content involved very global praise, job selection advice, or posing a question which corresponded to the supervisor's criteria for the next time period of the experience.

The percentage of criteria used in the written records was encouragingly high for two of the supervisors (i.e. Fran - 78% and Renee - 81%), while Leslie's percentaage was only 55%. Conversely, the number of cognitive map criteria not found in the written records was striking: Fran (5/23 or 22%), Renee (7/36 or 19%), and Leslie (22/49 or 45%). In general, these unused criteria occurred predominately in written records from the middle part of the experience when supervisors seemed to be focusing on fewer criteria, especially classroom management, instructional planning, and lesson delivery. In addition, this finding about supervisors' percentage of unused criteria may be interpreted from two perspectives. A number of these criteria seem to be subsumable as sub-points under other criteria which are heavily used, and some of them do not typically surface as topics in classroom observation evidence.

In the latter case, analysis of other data such as conversations between triad members and/or structured "think aloud" interviews with the university supervisor could reveal whether or not these criteria are actually used in making evaluative judgments.

Across the three supervisors in general, the criteria which received the greatest percentage of emphasis in written records were those related to observable instructional and management processes and the implied necessity of effective lesson preparation for it. This is particularly true for the so-called weak student teachers who received proportionally more written comments about these topics than the average and strong individuals. Less attention was given overall to student teachers' personal qualities and occupational socialization. This pattern corresponds closely to Zeichner's apprenticeship paradigm and recommendations of the clinical supervision movement that supervisors should focus on observable actions of the teaching/learning process, not on a teacher's personality. This pattern is not surprising, also, because the study has been limited to analyzing classroom observation written records, not audiotapes of conferences, etc.

In terms of types of language and syntax used, Renee and Leslie's written comments were direct statements to an overwhelming degree, while Fran used an observed situation to occasionally pose a question for the student teacher to think about. Renee's written comments are notably brief, even terse, suggesting the problem of whether or not student teachers could derive much pedagogical meaning from these two - three word phrases. Leslie's comments are in contrast to her detailed cognitive map criteria statements. Her observation notes are written in conversational language and in short - moderate length sentences. They include a modest level of pedagogical language and seem to be easily understandable although perhaps not as pedagogically challenging for a student teacher as they might be. In contrast to both of these, Fran's written comments exhibit the impact of her special preparation as a supervisor. Her remarks involve longer and more precise descriptions of what was observed, often followed by a question, suggestion, or specific praise that links pedagogical concepts to classroom actions. Her reports read more like a written "think aloud" analysis using the classroom situation as a source of data for a "tutorial" dialogue on the teaching-learning process.

Of course, much of the pedagogical impact of these written feedback records depends on how their content is discussed by each student teacher and supervisor in the post-lesson conference. Nevertheless, interest in the language, syntax, and feedback content of written supervisory records is warranted because they have a quality of high impact permanancy, and thus can be easily reviewed at some future time, while the content of an oral conference can not. This is particularly true because many supervisory conferences are surrounded by anxiety and time-pressure for everyone involved.

The number of criteria found in each separate written observation record from the three supervisors was low --- i.e. Fran: from 1 - 4; Renee: from 2 - 6; and Leslie: 2 - 5. This finding may be interpreted from the point of view of social judgment theory which emphasizes that human beings generally use only a few of all the possible criteria available when making decisions (39). A rather common piece of "conventional wisdom" for supervisors also involves the idea that a supervisor should be selective about what and how many feedback points are shared with a teacher, lest the teacher be overwhelmed and unable to

focus on anything. As one would expect, the number of criteria found in the final summary reports written by the supervisors was larger --- i.e. Fran: 2 - 6; Renee: 3 - 6; Leslie: 1 - 4 (note: her college's form has an eight item Likert-scale and only a small space for the supervisor's open-ended comments). Addressing more criteria in these reports is, of course, desirable because they are intended to be summary documents prepared for an external (i.e. employer) audience.

The congruence of these three supervisors' cognitive map criteria and written records is impressive and even surprising to the research team. However, these data only begin to illuminate the many questions which surround the implicit evaluative judgment criteria and processes of supervisors.

- Which is potentially more important in effective and valid supervisory evaluative judgments and communication: a detailed cognitive map of effective instruction and/or a rich language with which to communicate about instruction?
- What patterns would a parallel study examining oral supervisory communication reveal?
- Compared to what university supervisors intend to communicate about their evaluative judgments through written records, what do student teachers and cooperating teachers actually understand about the progress of the student teacher?
- Compared to what university supervisors intend to communicate about their evaluative judgments through written records, what do student teachers and cooperating teachers actually understand about the progress of the student teacher?

CONCLUSIONS & FURTHER QUESTIONS

This study has sought to better understand the "what is" situation of evaluative judgments and processes of university supervisors by exploring role perspectives, evaluative judgment criteria, and written records of three typical student teacher supervisors with contrasting professional backgrounds. The three case study subjects were selected as typical supervisors who work in rather conventional student teaching programs in this country.

The research data obtained in this study permit us to conclude several things. First of all, the data in these three cases support the many informed opinions and scant research we have on the problematic state of university student teacher supervision at this time. On one hand, universities have seemingly weak job selection criteria, support systems, and reward structures for supervisors. Supervisors themselves also often lack a specific knowledge-base related to their responsibilities and do not have much metacognitive, reflective awareness of their own judgment criteria and processes (40). Additionally, questions regarding the reliability and validity of student teacher evalution judgments deserve further investigation beyond these three preliminary case studies.

Secondly, the data permit us to understand several points more deeply than "conventional wisdom" about supervision has previously allowed. Three points will be addressed here as examples.

A contradictory tension exists between the current practitioner-oriented backgrounds and role perspectives of university supervisors and the inquiry-oriented paradigm for student teaching programs. While supervisors seem readily able to recognize (even without special training) the important role of liberal arts and content knowledge (i.e. academic paradigm), technical skills (i.e. behavioristic paradigm), individual maturity (i.e. personalistic paradigm), and occupational socialization (i.e. appenticeship paradigm) in preparing beginning teachers, they do not so readily include reflective, analytical, and change-oriented criteria in their cognitive maps of effective teaching. This would seem to have implications both for how they view their own roles as supervisors and for what they expect from student teachers.

Thus, conventional university supervision itself can be viewed as a key part of the conservative bias against change and reform in the educational field and personnel of which Lortie (41) writes. In this way, the contextual barriers which block efforts to reform university supervision and teaching itself have been better illuminated. While discussions about professionalizing teaching have been occurring widely during the past decade, these issues have not yet been raised in the field of supervision.

Responses to such concerns have included calls for increases in inservice education opportunities for supervisors (42), changes in the traditional role definitions of university supervisors to something more like clinical professors (43), and mandatory certification of teacher educators (44). The functions of such clinical professors would include instructing and monitoring preservice students, working with inservice teachers and administrators, and using the schools as laboratories for research into educational practice.

However, preparation for this broader role implies more substantial professional knowledge/skills/attitudes related to effective teaching, teacher development, research methodology, organizational development, communication, motivation, and evaluation than are now emphasized. That broader role description emphasizes what some have called the subtle, ambiguous, multidimensional nature of this type of role which blends and balances theory and practice relationships.

We can also ask how certain characteristics of the university supervisor function unwittingly to diminish a student teacher's opportunity to learn. Several factors, such as a supervisor's perceptual biases, judgment criteria, cognitive complexity, developmental stages of concern about job responsibilities, the Clinical Instructor/Evaluator role balance, etc., can dramatically influence observation, interaction, and evaluative judgments.

FIGURE 1 is a summary of our research team's current thinking about the factors potentially influencing a supervisor's evaluative judgment criteria and processes. Again, while "conventional wisdom" has long recognized that there are so-called "good" and "not so good" supervisors, we now know more about these specific factors and can begin to analyze their influence.

In addition, the benefits of supervisory networking, throughtful job-related discussions, and self-directed professional development warrant attention. While these benefits seem obvious to any educator, the truth of the matter is that such professional development opportunities related to supervision are rarely available or used. The need to cultivate awareness, motivation, and respect for the complexities of effective supervision is crucial both in supervisors themselves and in their university workplaces.

Interestingly, each supervisor reported that participating in the research project had stimulated her to greater self-awareness concerning the complexity and specificity of her own evaluative judgment criteria and processes. Without exception, they said they had not thought deeply or frequently about these things before. There would seem to be some indirect professional development impact caused by reflecting on one's own supervisory judgment criteria and role perspectives. Activities to develop supervisor reflection and meta-cognition do not appear to be widely used in the more technique-oriented, supervisory training programs and materials which exist around the country. This area deserves further attention.

Finally, the research methodology developed for this study --- i.e. a combination of structured interviewing and cognitive mapping techniques --- has proved to be both practical and reliable. Using this methodology to further explore the persistent problems of reliability and validity in teacher evaluation would seem to be promising.

In conclusion, little attention has been given yet to supervisory research and training in light of the increasing knowledge we have about effective teaching as a source of judgment criteria. In addition, the historical emphasis on supervisory technique should be balanced with attention to the cognitive processes used in making evaluative judgments. This series of studies are being undertaken to describe the role perspectives and evaluative judgment criteria of supervisors in order to reveal the largely unrecognized, complex mental life of student teacher supervisors. Despite criticism, the position of university student teacher supervisor has endured in various forms in the education professoriate. These studies should provide a basis for improving the selection, training, and rewarding of supervisors and for deepening and expanding research on supervision.

REFERENCE NOTES

1 - By the term "university student teacher supervisor", we include those who supervise student teachers on either a full-time or part-time basis for colleges and universities. By using this phrase for conciseness, we are not limiting ourselves to those employed by universities only.

2 - Christopher M. Clark and Penelope L. Peterson, "Teachers' Thought Processes" in Handbook of Research on Teaching, ed. M.C. Wittrock (3rd edition) (New York: Macmillan, 1986), pp. 255-296; Hugh Munby, "The Place of Teachers' Beliefs in Research on Teaching and Decision-making and on Alternative Methodology" (Report No. 9042. Austin: University of Texas Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, 1982); Richard J. Shavelson and Paula Stern, "Research on Teachers' Pedagogical Thoughts, Judgments, Decisions, and Behavior," Review of Educational Research, 51 (Winter 1981), pp. 455-498; Robert J. Yinger and Christopher M. Clark, "Self-reports of Teacher Judgment" (Research Series No. 134. East Lansing: Michigan State University, Institute for Research on Teaching) (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 241 495, 1983).

3 - Donald A. Schon, The Reflective Practitioner: How Professionals Think in Action (New York: Basic Books, 1983); Donald A. Schon, Educating the Reflective Practitioner (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1987).

4 - Gary A. Griffin, "Supervision and Evaluation in Student Teaching, Induction, and Inservice" (Report No. 9054. Austin: University of Texas Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, 1984); Gene E. Hall, "Clinical Supervision in Teacher Education as a Research Topic," Journal of Teacher Education, 35 (July-August 1983), pp. 56-58; D. John McIntyre, "A Response to the Critics of Field Experience Supervision," Journal of Teacher Education, 35 (May-June 1984), pp. 42-45; Kenneth M. Zeichner, "The Ecology of Field Experience: Toward an Understanding of the Role of Field Experiences in Teacher Education," Journal of Research and Development in Education, 18 (Summer 1985), pp. 44-52.

5 - The Supervisory Judgment Forum group began to meet in the fall of 1983 and included three experienced student teacher supervisors (Drs. Arden Moon, Roger Niemeyer, and Joanne Simmons), the overall department chairperson who had responsibility for administering five alternative student teaching programs (Dr. Henrietta Barnes), and a cognitive psychologist with experience in research on decision-making (Dr. Chris Clark).
The subsequent, multi-stage research project has been designed by Simmons, Moon, and Niemeyer to extend their original dual roles as researchers and as research subjects in the Forum group to now include other sets of student teacher supervisors as research subjects. The purpose of this is to produce further descriptive data and to continue to develop these methodological approaches for studying supervisors' cognitive maps of effective teacher performance and their use in the complex process of clinical instruction and evaluation of student teachers.
SEE ALSO: Roger C. Niemeyer and R. Arden Moon, "Researching Decision-making in the Supervision of Student Teachers: A Study of Supervisory Judgments" (paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research

Association, San Francisco, April 1986) (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 268 102); Joanne M. Simmons, "An Exploration of the Role Perspectives & Evaluative Judgment Criteria of Three University Student Teacher Supervisors" (East Lansing: Michigan State University, Department of Teacher Education, 1986) (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 285 855); Roger C. Niemeyer and R. Arden Moon, "Discovering Supervisors' Thought Patterns Through Journals" (paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Washington, DC, April 1987) (ERIC Document No. ED xxx xxx); Joanne M. Simmons, R. Arden Moon, and Roger C. Niemeyer, "A Critique of Recent Theories, Methods, & Variables Related to Researching the Thinking & Evaluative Decision-making of Instructional Supervisors" (paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Washington, DC, April 1987) (ERIC Document No. ED xxx xxx and submitted as article to the Review of Educational Research); R. Arden Moon, Joanne M. Simmons, and Roger C. Niemeyer, "The Role of Reflection in Mediating Supervisory Experience, Knowledge, and Judgment" (paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association of Teacher Educators, San Diego, February 1988) (ERIC Document No. ED xxx xxx and submitted as article to the Journal of Curriculum and Supervision); R. Arden Moon, Roger C. Niemeyer, and Joanne M. Simmons, "Three Perspectives on the Language of Supervision: How Well Do the University Supervisor, Cooperating Teacher, & Student Teacher Understand Each Other?" (paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, April 1988) (ERIC Document No. ED xxx xxx); Joanne M. Simmons and Georgea M. Sparks, "Judgment Criteria Perspectives on a New "Teacher as Reflective Decision-maker" Model of Teacher Supervision & Evaluation" in book titled ????, ed. R. Clift and H. Waxman (Washington, DC: Office of Educational Research and Improvement, in press), pp. xxx - xxx.

6 - Bruce Joyce, Sam J. Yarger, and Kenneth R. Howey, Preservice Teacher Education (Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University, Center for Educational Research, 1977).

7 - Jane H. Applegate, "Early Field Experiences: Recurring Dilemmas," Journal of Teacher Education, 36 (March-April 1985), pp. 60-64; Jon J. Denton, "Do Early Field Experiences in Teacher Education Provide a Meaningful Context for Acquiring Pedagogical Knowledge?" (paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal, April 1985); Peggy Ishler and Richard S. Kay, "A Survey of Institutional Practice" in Exploratory Field Experiences in Teacher Education, ed. Clark Webb, Nathalie Geherke, Peggy Ishler, and Alicia Mendoza (Reston, VA: Association of Teacher Educators, 1980), pp. 15-22; Mark R. Malone,, "Preservice Field Experience in Teacher Education: A Qualitative Synthesis" (paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, April 1985); Charles Moore, "National Survey Queries Early Field Experiences" Association of Teacher Educators (ATE) Newsletter, 13 (November/December 1979), p. 3.

8 - D. John McIntyre, Field Experiences in Teacher Education: From Student to Teacher (Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education Foundation for Excellence in Teacher Education and ERIC Clearinghouse for Teacher Education, 1983); James F. Nolan, "Professional Laboratory Experiences: The Missing Link in Teacher Education," Journal of Teacher Education, 33, (July-August 1982), pp. 49-53; Thomas F. Ryan, "Field Experiences in Teacher Education" in Encyclopedia of Educational Research, ed. Harold Mitzel (5th ed.) (New York: Free Press, 1982), pp. 682-686; Kenneth M.

Zeichner, "Myths and Realities: Field-based Experiences in Preservice Teacher Education," Journal of Teacher Education, 31 (November-December 1980), pp. 45-55; Kenneth M. Zeichner, "The Ecology of Field Experience: Toward an Understanding of the Role of Field Experiences in Teacher Development," Journal of Research and Development in Education, 18 (Summer 1985), pp. 44-52.

9 - Gary A. Griffin, Robert Hughes, Marie E. Delfino, and Susan Barnes, "Student Teaching: A Review" (Austin: University of Texas Research and Development Center for Teacher Education) (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 223 565, 1981); Richard H. Hersh, Ray Hull, and Mary S. Leighton, "Student Teaching" in Encyclopedia of Educational Research, ed. Harold Mitzel (5th ed.) (New York: Free Press, 1982), pp. 1812-1822.

10 - Kenneth M. Zeichner, "The Ecology of Field Experience: Toward an Understanding of the Role of Field Experiences in Teacher Development," Journal of Research and Development in Education, 18 (Summer 1985), pp. 45, 48.

11 - Kenneth M. Zeichner, "Alternative Paradigms of Teacher Education," Journal of Teacher Education, 34 (May-June 1983), pp. 3-9.

12 - Ibid, p. 3.

13 - Ibid, p. 4.

14 - Ibid, p. 6.

15 - For a parallel discussion, see also: Nancy L. Zimpher and Kenneth R. Howey, "Adapting Supervisory Practices to Different Orientations of Teaching Competencece," Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, 2 (Winter 1987), pp. 101-127. Zimpher and Howey refer to four major purposes or domains of teacher education: (1) technical competence; (2) clinical competence; (3) personalized competence; and (4) critical competence.

16 - The American Association of College for Teacher Education (AACTE) and the Association of Teacher Educators (ATE) are currently sponsoring another national survey of teacher education program, faculty, and students in order to update earlier findings.

17 - Bruce Joyce, Sam J. Yarger, and Kenneth R. Howey, Preservice Teacher Education (Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University, Center for Educational Research, 1977), pp. 99-100.

18 - Novy Bowman, "Student Teacher Supervision, Practices, and Policies," Action in Teacher Education, 1 (Summer 1978), pp. 62-65.

19 - Kent Freeland, "Assessing Student Teaching," Teacher Educator, 15 (Autumn 1979), pp. 11-16; Douglas L. Herbster, "Generalists vs. Specialists in the Supervision of Student Teachers," Teacher Educator, 11 (Winter 1975-76), pp. 32-34; Nancy L. Quisenberry, James D. Quisenberry, and Margo Willis, "An Evaluation of the Southern Illinois University - Carbondale Center Approach to Professional Education Experiences" (paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association of Teacher Educators, Las Vegas, February 1978).

20 - D. John McIntyre, Field Experiences in Teacher Education: From Student to Teacher (Washington, DC: American Association for College for Teacher Education Foundation for Excellence in Teacher Education and ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, 1983), p. 13

21 - Novy Bowman, "Student Teacher Supervision, Practices, and Policies," Action in Teacher Education, 1 (Summer 1978), p. 64.

22 - Gary A. Griffin, Robert Hughes, Marie E. Delfino, and Susan Barnes, "Student Teaching: A Review" (Austin: University of Texas Research and Development Center for Teacher Education) (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 223 565, 1981).

23 - Ibid, p. 37.

24 - Judith E. Lanier and Judith Warren Little, "Research on Teacher Education," in Handbook of Research on Teacher Education, ed. M.C. Wittrock (3rd edition) (New York: Macmillan, 1986), pp. 527-569.

25 - D. John McIntyre, Field Experiences in Teacher Education: From Student to Teacher (Washington, DC: American Association for College for Teacher Education Foundation for Excellence in Teacher Education and ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, 1983); D. John McIntyre, "A Response to the Critics of Field Experience Supervision," Journal of Teacher Education, 35 (May-June 1984), pp. 42-45.

26 - Lois Thies-Sprinthall, "Supervision: An Educative or Mis-educative Process?", Journal of Teacher Education, 31 (July-August 1980), pp. 17-20.

27 - Sharon F. O'Neal, "Supervision of Student Teachers: Feedback and Evaluation" (Report No. 9047. Austin: University of Texas Research and Development Center for Teacher Education) (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 240 106, 1983).

28 - Sara A. Edwards, "Clinical Preservice Activities: Education, Development, Training --- Three Case Studies" (Report No. 9023. Austin: University of Texas Research and Development Center for Teacher Education) (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 240 099, 1982), p. 88.

29 - Dan C. Lortie, Schoolteacher: A Sociologial Study (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975).

30 - Gary A. Griffin, Robert Hughes, Marie E. Delfino, and Susan Barnes, "Student Teaching: A Review" (Austin: University of Texas Research and Development Center for Teacher Education) (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 223 565, 1981).

31 - Dan C. Lortie, Schoolteacher: A Sociologial Study (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975).

32 - Ann Lieberman and Lynne Miller, Teachers, Their World, and Their Work: Implications for School Improvement (Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1984).

33 - Frances Fuller, "Concerns of Teachers: A Developmental Conceptualization," American Educational Research Journal, 6 (March 1969), pp. 207-226; Joanne M. Simmons and Gloria M. Dennen, "Implications of Developmental Concerns Theory for the Student Teaching Experience," Michigan Association of Teacher Educators (MATE) Viewpoints, 5 (Spring 1983), pp. 12-17.

34 - Carl D. Glickman, Developmental Supervision: Alternative Practices for Helping Teachers Improve Instruction (Alexandria, VA: Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1981).

35 - Cynthia G. Desrochers, "Relationships Between Supervisory Directness and Justification in the Teacher-Supervisor Conference and Teachers' Perceptions of Supervisory Credibility," (paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, April 1986).

36 - Joanne M. Simmons and Georgea M. Sparks, "The Need for New Concepts of Teacher Supervision and Evaluation: The Implications of Identifying Reflection as an Explicit Goal of Teacher Education Programs," (paper presented at the OERI invitational Conference on Teacher Reflection, Houston, October 1987) (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED xxx xxx).

37 - Ann Lieberman and Lynne Miller, Teachers, Their World, and Their Work: Implications for School Improvement (Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1984).

38 - Joanne M. Simmons, R. Arden Moon, and Roger C. Niemeyer, "A Critique of Recent Theories, Methods, & Variables Related to Researching the Thinking & Evaluative Decision-making of Instructional Supervisors" (paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Washington, DC, April 1987) (ERIC Document No. ED xxx xxx and submitted as article to the Review of Educational Research).

39 - Ibid.

40 - For a discussion of the important role of reflection in supervision, see: Noreen B. Garman, "Clinical Supervision: Quackery or Remedy for Professional Development?", Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, 1 (Winter 1986), pp. 148-157; Noreen B. Garman, "Reflection, the Heart of Clinical Supervision: A Modern Rationale for Professional Practice," Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, 2 (Fall 1986), pp. 1-24; R. Arden Moon, Joanne M. Simmons, and Roger C. Niemeyer, "The Role of Reflection in Mediating Supervisory Experience, Knowledge, and Judgment" (paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association of Teacher Educators, San Diego, February 1988) (ERIC Document No. ED xxx xxx and submitted as article to the Journal of Curriculum and Supervision); Joanne M. Simmons and Georgea M. Sparks, "The Need for New Concepts of Teacher Supervision and Evaluation: The Implications of Identifying Reflection as an Explicit Goal of Teacher Education Programs," (paper presented at the OERI invitational Conference on Teacher Reflection, Houston, October 1987) (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED xxx xxx); Lee A. Turner-Muecke, Tom Russell, and Jane Bowyer, "Reflection-in-Action: Case Study of a Clinical Supervisor," Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, 2 (Fall 1986), pp. 40-49.

41 - Dan C. Lortie, Schoolteacher: A Sociologial Study (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975).

42 - Gary Rush and Judy Wood, "In-service Education of Teacher Educators: A National Survey," Action in Teacher Education, 4 (Fall 1982), pp. 71-73.

43 - Nancy Bredemeier, Richard Kindswatter, and William W. Wilen, "A Conceptualization of the Clinical Professorship" (paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association of Teacher Educators, New Orleans) (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 118 532, February 1975); James B. Conant, The Education of American Teachers (New York: McGraw Hill, 1963); Allen R. Warner, James M. Cooper, and W. Robert Houston, "Rethinking the Clinical Concept in Teacher Education," Journal of Teacher Education, 28 (January-February 1977), pp. 15-18.

44 - Doyle Watts, "Teacher Educators Should Be Certified," Journal of Teacher Education, 35 (January-February 1984), pp. 30-33.

TABLE 1: ROLE PERSPECTIVES OF THE THREE SUPERVISORS

	Fran	Renee	Leslie
BASIS OF JOB SATISFACTION	-involvement in K-12 setting & people's growth -human interaction -part-time job time compatibility	-involvement in K-12 setting & people's growth -human interaction -part-time job time compatibility	-involvement in K-12 setting & people's growth -inspiration from "good" teachers
BASIS OF JOB DISSATISFACTION	-time management conflicts -lack of institutional support -paperwork -stress of making negative eval. judg. of s.t.	-none	-time management conflicts -lack of institutional support -paperwork -stress of making negative eval. judg. of s.t.
OWN PROFESSIONAL DEV. CONCERNS (Fuller, 1969)	-supervisory tasks -program management	-personal -supervisory tasks	-personal -supervisory tasks -impact
PARADIGM FOR VIEWING S.T. EXPERIENCE (Zeichner, 1983)	-apprenticeship	-apprenticeship	-apprenticeship
SUPERVISOR'S PREDOMINATE ROLE	-clinical instructor	-inseparable	-evaluator
RELATIVE BALANCE & TIME SHIFT FOR SUPERVISOR'S ROLES OVER THE S.T. EXPERIENCE	CI/e	CI/e	ci/E
SUPERVISORY BELIEFS/STYLE (Glickman, 1981)			
- directive	33.5%	20.0%	13.4%
- collaborative	26.8%	40.2%	40.2%
- non-directive	40.2%	40.2%	53.6%

TABLE 2a: SPECIFIC EVALUATIVE JUDGMENT CRITERIA STATEMENTS & WEIGHTS
IDENTIFIED BY THREE SUPERVISORS (Fran)
(using her own words)

category name & specific criteria statement	% weights beginning/middle/end	average %	ranking
PROFESSIONAL COMMITMENT	15/ 0/ 0	15.0%	4th
- commitment to the ST experience	40/ 0/ 0	13.3%	2nd
- orientation to teaching: (student-centered or subject-centered)	5/ 0/ 0	1.6%	
PROFESSIONAL SKILLS	25/50/60	45.0%	1st
- knowledge of subject	20/ 0/ 0	6.7%	5th
- preparation of lesson (planning, materials, appropriateness, etc.)	5/ 0/ 0	1.7%	
- familiarity with curriculum/texts	0/ 5/ 0	1.7%	
- growing facility in translating paper plans to action	0/20/ 0	6.7%	5th
- organization of instruction (sequence, materials, opportunity for student response, seatwork, transition, closure)	0/ 0/10	3.3%	
- communication skills (is ST clear about content, directions, expectations? does ST seem to understand what students say or don't say?)	0/ 0/20	6.7%	5th
- instructional delivery (imaginative? routine? repeal of CT's style & material? original? smooth evidence of preparation?)	0/ 0/10	3.3%	
- M: integration of instructional & classroom management E: classroom management skills (do rules indicate an awareness of child development & readiness to do as expected? evidence of reteaching the rules as appropriate?)	0/25/20	15.0%	1st
HUMAN RELATIONS SKILLS	15/25/25	21.7%	2nd
- E: courtesy (human relations skills regarding children) E: human relations skills (do students seem comfortable? does ST seem comfortable in adult role? can ST deal with CT in classroom?)	15/ 0/20	11.7%	4th
- growing awareness of student differences & needs	0/ 5/ 0	1.7%	
- growing positive attitude about role of teacher in classroom regarding responsibility for student learning & attitudes	0/20/ 0	6.7%	5th
- teacher - student interactions (both quality (positive?) & quantity)	0/ 0/ 5	1.7%	
PROFESSIONAL SOCIALIZATION	15/25/15	18.3%	3rd
- E: sense of belonging in the classroom E: self-confidence M: more assertion of "teacher" role M: growing peer relationship with CT & faculty E: confidence (can deal with personality conflicts; assertive NOT aggressive; peer relationship with CT rather than with students; comfortable with authority)	15/15/10	13.3%	2nd
- willingness to self-evaluate objectively & growing ability to do so	0/10/ 0	3.3%	
- awareness of professional realities? school socialization process? intra-school politics?	0/ 0/ 5	1.7%	

TABLE 2b: SPECIFIC EVALUATIVE JUDGMENT CRITERIA STATEMENTS & WEIGHTS
IDENTIFIED BY THREE SUPERVISORS (Renee)
(using her own words)

category name & specific criteria statement	% weights beginning/middle/end	average %	ranking
PERSONALITY - ATTITUDE	13/11/24	16.0%	2nd
- B: willingness to accept change (criticism)	8/ 8/ 0	5.3%	
M: response to constructive criticism			
- B: love for children---rapport with students	17/27/16	20.0%	1st
B: respect for children & children's respect for teacher			
M: rapport with students			
M: rapport with staff			
M: rapport with parents			
E: respect for children			
E: rapport with children & staff			
- B: attitude---positive thinker	9/ 0/ 8	5.6%	
E: attitude			
- self-confidence	9/ 0/ 0	3.0%	
- eye contact	0/ 8/ 0	2.7%	
SUBJECT - MANAGEMENT SKILLS	49/50/59	52.7%	1st
- B: basic knowledge of subject matter	9/ 8/ 9	8.7%	5th
M: knowledge of subject			
E: basic knowledge of subject matter			
- B: lesson plans	8/ 8/16	10.7%	3rd
M: adequate lesson plans			
E: lesson plans			
E: planning skills			
- B: organization skills	8/ 0/ 9	5.6%	
E: organization skills			
- B: classroom management	9/ 9/ 9	9.0%	4th
M: classroom management---discipline			
E: classroom management			
- atmosphere of classroom---children's behavior, friendly, happy, etc.	8/ 0/ 0	2.7%	
- interior of classroom---bulletin boards, art projects, etc.	7/ 0/ 0	2.3%	
- time management	0/ 8/ 0	2.7%	
- use of various resources outside of curriculum	0/ 8/ 0	2.7%	
- flexibility---handling different situations	0/ 9/ 0	3.0%	
- ability to teach	0/ 0/ 9	3.0%	
- creativity	0/ 0/ 8	2.7%	
COMMUNICATION	8/ 9/17	11.3%	3rd
- B: speaking ability	8/ 9/17	11.3%	2nd
M: written & oral communication			
E: presentation skills			
E: communications			

TABLE 2c: SPECIFIC EVALUATIVE JUDGMENT CRITERIA STATEMENTS & WEIGHTS
IDENTIFIED BY THREE SUPERVISORS (Leslie)
(using her own words)

category name & specific criteria statement	% weights beginning/middle/end	average %	ranking
TEACHING PROCESS SKILLS	11/23/35	23.0%	1st
- creativity---a willingness to go beyond the text	4/ 0/ 0	1.3%	
- an enthusiasm for the subject matter taught	7/ 0/ 0	2.3%	
- some coming to terms with the problems of evaluation of student work	0/ 5/ 0	1.7%	
- M: ability to connect with the full class of students & hold their attention	0/ 7/ 8	5.0%	
B: an ability to gain and keep the attention of the entire group			
- ability to execute smooth transitions between classes/subject areas	0/ 4/ 0	1.3%	
- ability to plan and execute a lesson with definite structure, i.e. a beginning, middle, end	0/ 7/ 0	2.3%	
- actually assuming full responsibility for the class presentation	0/ 0/10	3.3%	
- B: mastery of several methods/techniques of teaching	0/ 0/17	5.7%	4th
B: increasing flexibility to apply a diversity of techniques			
CONTENT/COGNITIVE SKILLS	23/ 2/12	12.3%	5th
- knowledge of content of subject matter taught that goes beyond the minimal	10/ 0/ 0	3.3%	
- B: preparedness---willingness to put the time in to be prepared in appropriate ways	8/ 0/ 7	5.0%	
B: an increased eagerness to increase/improve their own knowledge of their content area specializations			
- B: a recognition of the inter-relationship among disciplines ---a kind of Renaissance person mentality	5/ 2/ 5	4.0%	
M: some evidence of seeing the inter-connectedness of curriculum subjects			
B: a perception of the interconnectedness of the disciplines of teaching, i.e. an interdisciplinary notion			

---continued on next page---

TABLE 2c: SPECIFIC EVALUATIVE JUDGMENT CRITERIA STATEMENTS & WEIGHTS IDENTIFIED BY THREE SUPERVISORS [Leslie] --- continued

category name & specific criteria statement	% weights beginning/middle/end	average %	ranking
PERSONAL MATURITY	20/32/15	22.3%	2nd
- adult stance with students---i.e. getting "over" the "I want them to like me" position	5/ 0/ 0	1.7%	
- B: idealism mixed with a good dose of realism & a crucial sense of humor	6/ 3/ 5	4.7%	
M: some ability to compromise ideals and principles in a realistic manner---not defeatist, not cynical---some evidence of acceptance of "realness" of demands of teaching			
E: a sense of reality, idealism tempered with realism about teaching			
- risk-taking---a willingness to take calculated risks in trying something new and different	4/ 0/ 0	1.3%	
- self-monitoring---the ability to evaluate self realistically, neither brow beating self nor denial of any shortcomings	5/ 0/ 0	1.7%	
- diminishment in self-consciousness and concern with self-achievement	0/ 7/ 0	2.3%	
- ability to handle criticism in a positive, mature manner	0/ 6/ 0	2.0%	
- M: flexibility in adjusting to unexpected events	0/11/ 0	3.7%	
M: evidence of ability to handle conflict and stress in a calm, mature manner			
M: good judgment, i.e. common sense in handling crisis if such should arise			
- evidence of growth in managing conflicting demands on time, e.g. home, school, other	0/ 5/ 0	1.7%	
- a sense of personal confidence and/or authority about self as teacher	0/ 0/10	3.3%	
PROFESSIONAL GROWTH	17/20/26	21.0%	4th
- B: responsibility for the task of being a student teacher, i.e. a seriousness about the job	10/ 5/10	8.3%	2nd
M: awareness of growing identification of self as an adult, teacher, professional			
E: a personal identification of self as teacher			
- B: interest in the profession itself---beyond the personal needs ---a desire that the profession itself be laudable ---interest in national & political aspects of teaching	3/ 3/ 0	2.0%	
M: interest in larger issues of education at a national and international level, e.g. literacy needs			
- B: diminishing self-consciousness & increasing concern over total development of students	4/ 7/ 0	3.7%	
M: continual growth of concern for the learning of students			
- M: evidence of some long-term goals and plans for remaining weeks of student teaching experience	0/ 5/16	7.0%	3rd
E: a sense of responsibility to continue to grow in their chosen profession of teaching			
E: an eagerness to continue teaching			

---continued on next page---

TABLE 2c: SPECIFIC EVALUATIVE JUDGMENT CRITERIA STATEMENTS & WEIGHTS IDENTIFIED BY THREE SUPERVISORS (Leslie) --- continued

category name & specific criteria statement	% weights beginning/middle/end	average %	ranking
INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIP SKILLS	29/23/12	21.3%	3rd
- B: ability to see & respect students as individuals, not stereotyping them	16/13/10	13.0%	1st
B: evidence that they like kids & respect their struggle and desire to grow and learn			
M: evidence of a largess, a profound acceptance of diversity in students & respect for student strengths			
M: positive rapport with the students---friendly but adult-like			
B: a genuine fondness for and respect for their students			
- B: interpersonal relationship skills, i.e. an ability to relate to both students and fellow teachers in a positive adult-like way	10/ 5/ 2	5.7%	4th
M: ability to relate well with adults in the school, i.e. principal, cooperating teacher, other teachers			
B: a feeling/sense of comradire with other teachers			
- B: interpersonal relationship skills with fellow student teachers---willingness to form a sense of comaraderie with other student teachers	3/ 5/ 0	2.7%	
M: ability & willingness to share experience and reflections at weekly seminar			

TABLE 2d: CATAGORIES OF EVALUATIVE JUDGMENT CRITERIA & WEIGHTS IDENTIFIED BY THE THREE SUPERVISORS
(using their own words)

	% weights beginning	middle	end	total points	average %	ranking
Fran						
-prof. commitment	45%	0%	0%	45	15.0%	4th
-prof. skills	25%	50%	60%	135	45.0%	1st
-human relations skills	15%	25%	25%	65	21.7%	2nd
-prof. socialization	15%	25%	15%	55	18.3%	3rd
TOTALS	100%	100%	100%	300	100.0%	
Renee						
-personality & attitude	43%	41%	24%	108	36.0%	2nd
-subject knowledge & management skills	49%	50%	59%	158	52.7%	1st
-communication	8%	9%	17%	34	11.3%	3rd
TOTALS	100%	100%	100%	300	100.0%	
Leslie						
-teaching process skills	11%	23%	35%	69	23.0%	1st
-content/cognitive skills	23%	2%	12%	37	12.3%	5th
-personal maturity	20%	32%	15%	67	22.3%	2nd
-prof. growth	17%	20%	26%	63	21.0%	4th
-interpersonal relationship skills	29%	23%	12%	64	21.3%	3rd
TOTALS	100%	100%	100%	300	99.9%	

TABLE 2e: COMPOSITE PORTRAITS OF AN EFFECTIVE STUDENT TEACHER HELD BY THE SUPERVISORS ACCORDING TO THE CRITERIA & WEIGHTS THEY IDENTIFIED
(using researcher's paraphrase of their own words)

ranking	average % weight	specific criteria statement
Fran		
1st	15.0%	- classroom management skills & integration of these with instruction
2nd	13.3%	- self-confidence and assertion of teacher role
"	"	- commitment to the ST experience
4th	11.7%	- human relations skills with pupils and CT
5th	6.7%	- knowledge of subject matter
"	"	- growing facility in translating instructional plans on paper into action
"	"	- communication skills with pupils
	"	- assumes responsibility as teacher for pupil learning & attitudes
TOTAL:	73.4%	
Renee		
1st	20.0%	- love, respect, & rapport with pupils & staff
2nd	11.3%	- oral & written communication skills
3rd	10.7%	- lesson planning skills
4th	9.0%	- classroom management & discipline
5th	8.7%	- knowledge of subject matter
TOTAL:	59.7%	
Leslie		
1st	13.0%	- love & respect for pupils with their individuality, diversity, & strengths
2nd	8.3%	- identification of self in adult, teacher, & professional roles
3rd	7.0%	- long-range goals & responsibility for own professional development
4th	5.7%	- interpersonal skills with pupils & staff
"	"	- use of a diversity of instructional methods/techniques
TOTAL:	39.7%	

Table 1: FLUENCY & COMPLEXITY DIFFERENCES IN THE EVALUATIVE JUDGMENT CRITERIA & WEIGHTS IDENTIFIED BY THE THREE SUPERVISORS

	Fran	Renee	Leslie
# OF CRITERIA STATEMENTS IDENTIFIED (beginning; middle; end of experience)	7;8;8	12;12;12	16;20;13
TOTAL # OF CRITERIA STATEMENTS IDENTIFIED	23	36	49
TOTAL # OF WORDS USED IN CRITERIA STATEMENTS	226	122	546
MEAN # OF WORDS USED IN CRITERIA STATEMENTS	9.8	3.4	11.1
RANGE IN POINT VALUES USED TO WEIGHT CRITERIA STATEMENTS	5 - 40	7 - 9	2 - 10
# OF MINUTES USED TO IDENTIFY CRITERIA STATEMENTS (beginning; middle; end of experience)	15;12;20	10;10;10	18;20;15
# OF SUB-GROUPINGS MADE FOR CRITERIA STATEMENTS	4	3	5

TABLE 4a: COMPARISON OF THE COGNITIVE MAP CRITERIA STATEMENTS & WRITTEN RECORDS OF THREE SUPERVISORS [Fran]
(using her own words)

specific criteria statements & actual written record %	actual wr. record %	intended cogn. map %	written record % for weak-aver.-strong ST
PROFESSIONAL COMMITMENT	0.3%	15.0%	0.03%- no- 0.9%
- B1: commitment to the ST experience [no]	no	13.3%	no- no- no
- B2: orientation to teaching (stud. or subj.-centered) [1.0%]	0.3%	1.6%	0.03%- no- 0.9%
PROFESSIONAL SKILLS	68.9%	45.0%	61.1%-74.1%-75.4%
- B3: knowledge of subject [9.0%]	3.0%	6.7%	2.4%- 3.5%- 3.7%
- B4: prep. of lesson (plan., mat'ls, appropri'ness) [49.8%]	16.6%	1.7%	11.2%-22.7%-19.4%
- M2: familiarity with curriculum/texts [2.8%]	0.9%	1.7%	no- no- 2.2%
- M3: growing facility in translating plans to action [no]	no	6.7%	no- no- no
- B2: organ. of instruc. (sequence, materials, opport. for stud. response, seatwork, transition, closure) [22.5%]	7.5%	3.3%	3.3%- 3.7%-16.3%
- B3: communication skills (is ST clear about content, directions, expectations? does ST seem to understand what students say or don't say?) [9.0%]	3.0%	6.7%	3.5%- 6.0%- no
- B4: instructional delivery (imaginative? routine? repeat of CT? smooth evidence of preparation?) [11.4%]	3.8%	3.3%	3.6%- 7.3%- 1.3%
- M1: integration of instruct. & cl'room management [80.0%]	34.1%	15.0%	37.1%-30.9%-32.5%
B1: classroom management skills (do rules indicate awareness of ch. dev. & readiness to do as expected? evidence of reteaching the rules as appropriate?) [22.2%]			
HUMAN RELATIONS SKILLS	21.6%	21.7%	25.7%-14.6%-17.2%
- B5: courtesy (human relat. skills regarding child.) [37.9%]	10.9%	11.7%	25.7%-14.6%-10.7%
B5: human relat. skills (do studs. seem comfortable? does ST seem comfortable in adult role? can ST deal with CT in classroom?) [18.7%]			
- M4: growing awareness of student differences & needs [no]	no	1.7%	no- no- no
- M5: growing pos. attitude about role of teacher in classroom regarding resp. for stud. learning & attitudes [6.5%]	2.2%	6.7%	no- no- 5.1%
- B6: teach. - stud. interactions (both qual. & quant.) [1.4%]	0.5%	1.7%	no- no- 1.4%
PROFESSIONAL SOCIALIZATION	9.3%	18.3%	12.8%-11.2%- 6.5%
- B6: sense of belonging in the classroom [0.5%]	5.4%	13.3%	6.3%- 6.8%- 6.5%
B7: self-confidence [1.8%]			
M6: more assertion of "teacher" role [10.9%]			
M7: growing peer relationship with CT & faculty [no]			
B7: confidence (can deal with pers'lity conflicts; assertive NOT aggressive; peer relationship with CT rather than with students; comfortable with authority) [3.0%]			
- M8: willingness & ability to self-evaluate objectively [no]	no	3.3%	no- no- no
- B8: awareness of prof. realities? school socialization process? intra-school politics? [11.8%]	3.9%	1.7%	6.5%- 4.4%- no

TABLE 4b: COMPARISON OF THE COGNITIVE MAP CRITERIA STATEMENTS & WRITTEN RECORDS OF THREE SUPERVISORS [Renee]
(using her own words)

specific criteria statements & actual written record %	actual wr. record %	intended cogn. map %	written record % for weak-aver.-strong ST
PERSONALITY - ATTITUDE	13.3%	36.0%	3.1%-18.1%-18.7%
- B1: willingness to accept change (criticism) [no]	no	5.3%	no- no- no
M1: response to constructive criticism [no]			
- B2: love for children---rapport with students [no]	12.4%	20.0%	2.6%-17.2%-16.1%
B3: respect for child. & child.'s respect for teacher [4.3%]			
M4: rapport with students [11.4%]			
M2: rapport with staff [no]			
M3: rapport with parents [no]			
B2: respect for children [7.3%]			
B3: rapport with children & staff [14.2%]			
- B4: attitude---positive thinker [no]	0.9%	5.6%	no- 0.9%- 2.6%
B1: attitude [2.8%]			
- B5: self-confidence [no]	no	3.0%	no- no- no
- M5: eye contact [0.046]	0.02%	2.7%	0.5%- no- no
SUBJECT - MANAGEMENT SKILLS	81.4%	52.7%	90.3%-79.5%-74.6%
- B6: basic knowledge of subject matter [19.5%]	12.8%	8.7%	21.8%- 7.5%- 8.7%
M6: knowledge of subject [2.6%]			
B4: basic knowledge of subject matter [16.3%]			
- B7: lesson plans [20.6%]	21.2%	10.7%	18.7%-14.6%-31.9%
M7: adequate lesson plans [29.8%]			
B5: lesson plans [7.4%]			
B10: planning skills [5.8%]			
- B8: organization skills [7.0%]	3.6%	5.6%	8.7%- 2.1%- no
E8: organization skills [3.8%]			
- B9: classroom management [40.6%]	34.2%	9.0%	27.7%-44.4%-28.8%
M8: classroom management---discipline [39.6%]			
B6: classroom management [22.3%]			
- B10: atmosphere of classroom---ch.'s behav., friendly [2.6%]	0.9%	2.7%	2.9%- no- no
- B11: interior of classroom---bulletin boards, etc. [2.7%]	0.9%	2.3%	no- 2.2%- 0.5%
- M9: time management [10.1%]	3.4%	2.7%	7.3%- 2.8%- no
- M10: use of various resources outside of curriculum [0.006%]	0.002%	2.7%	no- no- 0.6%
- M11: flexibility---handling different situations [1.7%]	0.6%	3.0%	no- 1.8%- no
- B7: ability to teach [4.4%]	1.5%	3.0%	0.6%- 2.0%- 2.0%
- B9: creativity [7.0%]	2.3%	2.7%	2.6%- 2.1%- 2.1%
COMMUNICATION	5.0%	11.3%	6.6%- 2.3%- 6.7%
- B12: speaking ability [2.7%]	5.0	11.3%	6.6%- 2.3%- 6.7%
M12: written & oral communication [3.7%]			
B11: presentation skills 7.2%]			
B12: communications [1.5%]			

TABLE 4c: COMPARISON OF THE COGNITIVE MAP CRITERIA STATEMENTS & WRITTEN RECORDS OF THREE SUPERVISORS (Leslie)
(using her own words)

specific criteria statements & actual written record %	actual wr. record %	intended cogn. map %	written record % for weak-aver.-strong SP
TEACHING PROCESS SKILLS	49.0%	23.0%	62.5%-37.6%-44.9%
- B1: creativity---a willingness to go beyond the text (1.5%)	0.5%	1.3%	no- 1.3%- 0.4%
- B2: an enthusiasm for the subject matter taught (16.3%)	5.4%	2.3%	12.8%- 1.4%- 0.4%
- M1: some coming to terms with the problems of evaluation of student work (no)	no	1.7%	no- no- no
- M2: ability to connect with the full class of students & hold their attention (25.0%)	13.4%	5.8%	12.5%-12.3%-14.7%
B2: ability to gain & keep the attent. of the group (15.2%)			
- M3: ability to execute smooth transitions (2.0%)	0.7%	1.3%	no- 2.7%- no
- M4: ability to plan and execute a lesson with definite structure, i.e. a beginning, middle, end (53.4%)	17.8%	2.3%	17.4%-17.8%-18.2%
- B1: assuming full resp. for the class presentation (14.5%)	4.8%	3.3%	12.5%- no- 2.3%
- B3: mastery of several methods/techniques of teaching (4.3%)	6.4%	5.7%	7.3%- 2.1%- 8.9%
B4: increasing flexibility to apply a diversity of techniques (14.8%)			
CONTENT/COGNITIVE SKILLS	13.7%	12.3%	14.2%-12.2%-14.8%
- B3: knowledge of subject matter taught that goes beyond the minimal (7.6%)	2.5%	3.3%	6.6%- no- no
- B4: preparedness---willingness to put time in to be prepared in appropriate ways (32.0%)	11.2%	5.0%	7.6%-12.2%-14.8%
B6: an increased eagerness to increase/improve their own knowledge of their content area specializations (1.5%)			
- B5: a recognition of inter-relationship among disciplines ---a kind of Renaissance person mentality (no)	no	4.0%	no- no- no
M5: some evidence of seeing the inter-connectedness of curriculum subjects (no)			
B5: a perception of the interconnectedness of the disciplines of teaching, i.e. an interdisciplinary notion (no)			

---continued on next page---

TABLE 4c: COMPARISON OF THE COGNITIVE MAP CRITERIA STATEMENTS & WRITTEN RECORDS OF THREE SUPERVISORS (Leslie)
(using her own words)

specific criteria statements & actual written record %	actual wr. record %	intended cogn. map %	written record % for weak-aver.-strong SV
TEACHING PROCESS SKILLS	49.0%	23.8%	42.5%-37.6%-44.9%
- B1: creativity---a willingness to go beyond the text (1.5%)	0.5%	1.3%	no- 1.3%- 0.4%
- B2: an enthusiasm for the subject matter taught (16.3%)	5.4%	2.3%	12.8%- 1.4%- 0.4%
- M1: some coming to terms with the problems of evaluation of student work (no)	no	1.7%	no- no- no
- M2: ability to connect with the full class of students & hold their attention (25.0%)	13.4%	5.0%	12.5%-12.3%-14.7%
B2: ability to gain & keep the attent. of the group (15.2%)			
- M3: ability to execute smooth transitions (2.0%)	0.7%	1.3%	no- 2.7%- no
- M4: ability to plan and execute a lesson with definite structure, i.e. a beginning, middle, end (53.4%)	17.8%	2.3%	17.4%-17.8%-18.2%
- B1: assuming full resp. for the class presentation (14.5%)	4.8%	3.3%	12.5%- no- 2.3%
- B3: mastery of several methods/techniques of teaching (4.3%)	6.4%	5.7%	7.3%- 2.1%- 8.9%
B4: increasing flexibility to apply a diversity of techniques (14.8%)			
CONTENT/COGNITIVE SKILLS	13.7%	12.3%	14.2%-12.2%-14.8%
- B3: knowledge of subject matter taught that goes beyond the minimal (7.6%)	2.5%	3.3%	6.6%- no- no
- B4: preparedness---willingness to put time in to be prepared in appropriate ways (32.0%)	11.2%	5.0%	7.6%-12.2%-14.8%
B6: an increased eagerness to increase/improve their own knowledge of their content area specializations (1.5%)			
- B5: a recognition of inter-relationship among disciplines ---a kind of Renaissance person mentality (no)	no	4.0%	no- no- no
M5: some evidence of seeing the inter-connectedness of curriculum subjects (no)			
B5: a perception of the interconnectedness of the disciplines of teaching, i.e. an interdisciplinary notion (no)			

---continued on next page---

TABLE 4c: COMPARISON OF THE COGNITIVE MAP CRITERIA STATEMENTS & WRITTEN RECORDS OF THREE SUPERVISORS [Leslie] --- continued

specific criteria statements & actual written record %	actual wr. record %	intended cogn. map %	written record % for weak-aver.-strong ST
INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIP SKILLS	7.8%	21.3%	6.6%- 9.9%- 8.1%
- B13: ability to see & respect students as individuals, not stereotyping them [1.1%]	4.8%	13.0%	5.9%- 6.7%- 3.4%
B14: evidence that they like kids & respect their struggle and desire to grow and learn [no]			
M17: evidence of a largess, a profound acceptance of diversity in students & respect for student strengths [no]			
M18: positive rapport with students---friendly but adult-like [3.4%]			
B12: genuine fondness for and respect for students [10.0%]			
- B15: interpersonal relationship skills, i.e. an ability to relate to both students and fellow teachers in a positive adult-like way [1.1%]	3.0%	5.7%	0.7%- 3.2%- 4.7%
M20: ability to relate well with adults in the school, i.e. principal, cooperating teacher, other teachers [5.1%]			
B13: a feeling/sense of comradire with other teachers [2.8%]			
- B16: interpersonal relationship skills with fellow student teachers---willingness to form a sense of comraderie with other student teachers [no]	no	2.7%	no- no- no
M19: ability & willingness to share experience and reflections at weekly seminar [no]			

FIGURE 1: A MODEL OF FACTORS INFLUENCING SUPERVISORY EVALUATIVE JUDGMENT CRITERIA & PROCESSES

THE SUPERVISOR --- as influenced by training and experience

KNOWLEDGE-BASE

- effective teaching/learning/schooling
- teacher education/staff development
- supervision

ATTITUDES AND BELIEFS

- goals of teaching/learning/schooling
- goals of student teaching experience
- own supervisory role perceptives
- own supervisory job satisfaction
- own supervisory developmental stages of concern (a la Fuller)
- own supervisory style (Glickman)
- own supervisory self-efficacy beliefs (a la Guskey)

DATA COLLECTION AND COGNITIVE PROCESSING

- perceptual alertness
- perceptual comprehensiveness
- critical thinking skills & habits
  practitioner vs. theoretical orientation (Lieberman & Miller)
- cognitive style
- cognitive complexity (Hunt)
- awareness of own metacognition processes
- awareness of own attitudes and beliefs
- awareness of own perceptual biases
- awareness of own knowledge-base
- awareness of others' perspectives